

E 376

.M67

Copy 2













“A MIRROR  
FOR  
THE PRETENDED DEMOCRACY,”

FROM THE NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER OF OCTOBER 1, 1840:

To which is added,

A REPORT ON EXECUTIVE PATRONAGE,

Made to the Senate of the United States, May 4, 1826,

BY A SELECT COMMITTEE,

CONSISTING OF MESSRS. BENTON, MACON, VAN BUREN, WHITE, DICKERSON,  
HOLMES, HAYNE, AND JOHNSON OF KENTUCKY.

---

Among the objections to the present Administration, following in the footsteps of the last, which deserve a more particular consideration than they have heretofore received from us, is the great extent to which EXECUTIVE PATRONAGE has been employed, according to the maxim of the dominant party, for the rewarding its friends and the punishment of its enemies, and with a view to the perpetuation of its own power. Perhaps our readers, for the interest of the subject, will keep company with us whilst we hastily pass in review the political history of the few past years in reference to the extension, perversion, and abuse of Executive patronage.

It is within the recollection of every reader how great a clamor was raised, during the Presidency of Mr. J. Q. ADAMS, against his Administration, for its imputed disposition to extend and augment the Executive patronage with a view to political power, &c. Unfounded and unjust as the imputation was, it was the chief of the ostensible grounds of opposition to the re-election of Mr. ADAMS. To give it more consequence in the public eye, it was made the subject of labored inquiries and solemn reports by party committees in both Houses of Congress, and of prolonged and vehement debates in those bodies, as well as of the most insidious appeals to popular prejudice; in which service all the arts by which demagogues so well know how to dupe the people when they want to make use of them, were put in requisition.

We recur to the records of that day as well for the purpose of showing what doctrines were then maintained by those who are now at the head of the pretended democratic party, as also for authentic official evidence of the actual extent of Executive patronage, direct and indirect, which these pure and disinterested patriots, to answer the purpose they had then in hand, represented as a crying grievance. From the printed documents of Congress now before us we extract the following particulars:

In the SENATE of the United States, on the 8th day of February, 1826, the following resolution, moved by Mr. MACON, (at the instance, probably, of Mr. BENTON,) was adopted without a division, viz:

“Resolved, That the committee to whom have been referred the several resolutions to amend the Constitution of the United States, be instructed to inquire into the expediency of diminishing or regulating the patronage of the Executive of the United States, and that the committee have leave to report by bill or otherwise.”

[This committee consisted of Mr. BENTON, Mr. MACON, Mr. VAN BUREN, and six other Senators]

On the 4th day of May, 1826, Mr. BENTON, the chairman of this committee, produced to the Senate, as the result of their deliberations, a report, beginning as follows:

“After mature deliberation, the committee are of opinion that it is expedient to diminish, or to regulate, by law, the Executive patronage of the Federal Government, whenever the same can be done consistently with the provisions of the Constitution, and without impairing the proper efficiency of the Government. Acting under this conviction they have reviewed, as carefully as time and other engagements would permit them to do, the degree and amount of patronage now exercised by the President, and have arrived at the conclusion that the same may, and ought to, be diminished by law.”

"In coming to the conclusion (says the report, further) that Executive patronage ought to be diminished and regulated, on the plan proposed, [by six several bills reported by the committee, but never passed upon,] the committee rest their opinion on the ground that the exercise of great patronage in the hands of one man has a constant tendency to *subvert the purity of our institutions and endanger the liberties of the country.*"

Inserting (or understanding) the word "*unnecessarily,*" or any word of similar import, before the word "*great,*" where it occurs in the above sentence, the doctrine which it includes is sound Whig doctrine, such as all real Democrats profess when out of power, and try to act upon when the power is in their hands. It is the doctrine upon which all branches of the Government acted during the first years of Mr. JEFFERSON's Administration; which the accident of war for several years put aside during a part of Mr. MADISON's; which was revived in practice after the exigencies of war ceased, was observed, with a good deal of consistency, during Mr. MONROE's, but was most rigidly practised upon during the Administration of Mr. J. Q. ADAMS, when Messrs. BENTON, VAN BUREN & Co. affected to take fright at the *alarming extent* of Executive patronage.

In order to show upon what grounds these gentlemen had arrived at the conclusion that the degree and amount of the patronage then exercised by the President might and ought to be diminished, the Senate's committee begins very properly by showing the extent to which that patronage then existed. We quote the report:

"The committee think it right to attempt to give an idea of the greatness of this power of patronage by referring to an example in a single city. They will take the city of New York, and a single branch of the federal patronage in that city; and, to avoid mistake or error, will limit their reference to a work of unquestionable authority upon this subject—the '*Blue Book*' of the Republic, which corresponds with the '*Red Book*' of monarchies, and will read from pages 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, of that growing little volume.

#### *Names and Compensation of the Officers of the Customs at New York.*

Jonathan Thompson,	Collector,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$4,000 00
Abraham R. Lawrence,	Appraiser,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000 00
Frederick Jenkins,	do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2,000 00
William Seignoret,	Clerk,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	500 00
John Condit,	Assist. Collector, Jersey,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000 00
John T. Vernon,	Surveyor,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150 00
John Kearney,	Deputy Collector,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500 00
Samuel S. Gardiner,	do.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500 00
David Thompson,	Cashier,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500 00
Nathaniel Shultz,	Auditor,	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,000 00

#### CLERKS.

Cornelius Duryee	-	\$650 00	Daniel Bennet	-	500 00	Wm. B. Byram	-	300 00
Ebenezer Platt	-	650 00	Jos. Ostroff, Jr.	-	500 00	And. H. Mickle	-	300 00
Jacob Duryee	-	600 00	James B. Thurston	-	500 00	Nathaniel Olcott	-	500 00
Zeophaer Platt	-	550 00	Norman Butler	-	600 00	David Seabury	-	500 00
Joseph Leonard	-	550 00	Samuel H. Eakin	-	600 00	Lewis M. Wiss	-	145 53
T. McCready, Jr.	-	550 00	Chas. A. Gardiner	-	510 00	John R. Keane	-	241 67
Wm. Wier	-	500 00	Thos. H. Dubois	-	500 00	Aaron Phillips	-	112 22
Wm. G. Haycock	-	500 00	Thos. Dennison	-	500 00	John Harrison	-	79 12
John H. Bail	-	500 00	William J. McMaster	-	500 00	Bernardus C. Lake	-	73 63
George W. Thompson	-	500 00	Andrew Martine	-	500 00	Junius Thompson	-	92 03
Wm. Tuthill	-	500 00	Isaac Bluxome	-	500 00	George Waterman	-	58 24
Joshua Philips	-	500 00	Henry Bull	-	500 00			

#### INSPECTORS.

James Anderson	-	\$1,095 00	Oliver Jaques	-	300 00	Sylvester Sullivan	-	1,095 00
James D. Bisset	-	1,086 00	Wm. Keope	-	1,095 00	Peter Taylor	-	300 00
Joseph Board	-	1,095 00	Peter Kinnman	-	1,095 00	Egbert Thompson	-	1,095 00
Abraham Boker	-	1,095 00	John B. Kissam	-	303 00	Wm. Underhill	-	300 00
John R. Bowne	-	1,090 00	John H. Leggett	-	1,095 00	B. M. Van Beuren	-	1,095 00
Geo. G. Burras	-	1,081 00	Jacob Ludlam	-	1,095 00	Wm. Van Beuren	-	1,095 00
John Byers	-	282 00	Donald McLean	-	1,077 00	Jacob Vanderpool	-	1,095 00
Charles Chipp	-	1,095 00	Samuel Marvin	-	1,095 00	John Van Dyck	-	1,095 00
Stephen Crane	-	1,095 00	James Mitchell	-	1,095 00	Andrew Van Tuyl	-	1,095 00
Moses Cunningham	-	297 00	John Morris	-	1,095 00	Jacob Van Winkle	-	1,095 00
Jos. Cutler	-	1,092 00	Walter Morton	-	1,095 00	Thomas Walton	-	1,092 00
Thomas Darling	-	1,095 00	John C. Mott	-	300 00	Thomas Waring	-	1,095 00
John De Camp	-	1,095 00	Wm. E. Nexen	-	1,095 00	Caleb T. Ward	-	1,095 00
Bertrand Dupoy	-	1,080 00	Richard Nixon	-	1,095 00	Richard Ward	-	1,095 00
Alfred Frank	-	1,085 00	Naphtali Phillips	-	1,095 00	Jedediah Waterman	-	1,095 00
Calvin Gay	-	1,011 00	Elipha Pinkney	-	1,095 00	Wm. Willing	-	1,095 00
John Gelsion	-	1,095 00	Richard Platt	-	1,080 00	John Whittlesey	-	1,095 00
Zaddock Hedden	-	1,095 00	James Porter	-	1,095 00	Elam Williams	-	1,095 00
George Howard	-	1,095 00	George Seaman	-	297 00	Jos. Willoughby	-	300 00
Bezaleel Howe	-	1,095 00	Walter Seaman	-	1,080 00	Benjamin Wood	-	1,095 00
Nathaniel Hunt	-	1,095 00	Elihu Smith	-	300 00	John Woodward	-	1,095 00
Robert Hunter	-	1,074 00	Peter R. Spranger	-	1,077 00			
George Junis	-	1,095 00	Dennis Stricker	-	1,095 00			



## GAUGERS.

Abraham Baudoine	-	1,769 83	Elias Nexen	-	1,339 29	Har. C. Tallman	-	1,843 66
Rinier V. Mooney	-	1,374 51	Arch. Somerville	-	1,015 49	Wm. R. Thompson	-	2,187 99

## WEIGHERS.

Ebenezer Belknap	-	1,781 17	Gerret Forbes	-	3,386 70	Jacob Stoutenburg	-	1,065 10
Alexander Blucher	-	1,619 94	Thomas Hazard	-	1,040 41	Jacob Tallman	-	2,363 10
Jeremiah Brower	-	1,830 74	Francis McClure	-	2,176 23	Elbert P. Waime	-	2,382 63
Elihu H. Decamp	-	2,153 58	Alexander Nicoll	-	1,181 27			

## MEASURERS.

Samuel Burling	-	618 65	John Gould	-	1,040 29	Ephraim Snow	-	885 51
Nicholas G. Carmer	-	936 47	James W. Gray	-	833 66	Harmanus Vedder	-	1,041 43
Daniel Dodge	-	1,174 17	Wm. Philips	-	1,121 79	Peter Wynkoop	-	1,124 09
Ezekiel Dodge	-	727 33	Bernardus Rider	-	1,252 29	John J. Cluett	-	524 47
Peter Smith, Deputy Inspector of the Revenue	-			-			-	81,748 87
Ebenezer Cole, do.	-			-			-	600 35
Wm. Jessup, do.	-			-			-	1,235 71
G. Cunningham, do.	-			-			-	84 60
Henry Cahoon, Captain Revenue Cutter	-			-			-	819 00
Wm. Isaac, 1st Lieutenant do.	-			-			-	566 00
J. A. Bender, 2d do.	-			-			-	506 00
John S. Duane, Keeper of Light-house	-			-			-	400 00
John H. Gardiner, do.	-			-			-	350 00
Noah Mason, do.	-			-			-	300 00
Edward Shoemaker, do.	-			-			-	300 00
Charles H. Bernard, Light ship Master,	-			-			-	700 00
John Oakes, Mate,	-			-			-	350 00
John Ferguson, Naval Officer,	-			-			-	3,000 00
David S. Lyon, Deputy do.	-			-			-	1,500 00

## CLERKS.

Wm. Burtzell	-	\$800 00	Lewis D. Ozville	-	600 00	Lewis Webb, Jr.	-	400 00
John Cockle	-	750 00	Michael Roth	-	600 00	James McFarland	-	60 00
Philip Tabele	-	600 00	Henry Reed	-	60 00			
Samuel Osgood	-	600 00	Joseph B. Bleacher	-	500 00			
Joseph G. Swift, Surveyor,	-	2,500 00	E. B. Grayson, Third Clerk,	-	500 00			
Samuel Terry, Deputy do.	-	1,500 00	D. Thompson, Collecting do.	-	170 00			
Anthony Hafl, First Clerk,	-	800 00	John C. Mickle, Messenger,	-	300 00			
Pierre A. Young, Second do.	-	750 00	Thomas Brannan, Porter,	-	180 00			

"A formidable list, indeed! formidable in numbers, and still more so from the vast amount of money in their hands. The action of such a body of men, supposing them to be animated by one spirit, must be tremendous in an election; and that they will be so animated, is a proposition too plain to need demonstration. Power over a man's support has always been held and admitted to be *power* over his *will*. The President has 'power' over the 'support' of all these officers, and they again have 'power' over the 'support' of debtor merchants to the amount of ten millions of dollars per annum, and over the daily support of an immense number of individuals, professional, mechanical, and day-laboring, to whom they *can* and *will* extend, or deny, a valuable private as well as public patronage, according to the part which they shall act in *State*, as well as in *Federal*, elections. Still this is only a branch, a mere prong, of Federal patronage in the city of New York. The same Government has, in the same city, a Branch of the United States Bank, wielding a capital of many millions; a large military, naval, and post office establishment; a judiciary, with its appropriate officers; presses, which print the laws and public advertisements; and a long list of contractors and jobbers."

As at New York, so (further argues the Report) is it throughout the Union. "Everywhere, to the extreme frontier of the remotest State and Territory, Federal patronage will be found, in degree and force, proportionate to the population of the place, and forever augmenting with the increasing power of the Government. *Diminution of patronage is not thought of.*" "The power of patronage, unless checked by the vigorous interposition of Congress, must go on increasing, until Federal influence, in many parts of this Confederation, will predominate in elections as completely as British influence predominates in the elections of Scotland and Ireland, in rotten borough towns, and in the great naval stations of Portsmouth and Plymouth."

Confining ourselves, for the moment, to what concerns the *extension* of Executive patronage, (reserving for separate consideration other parts of this celebrated and really orthodox exposition of the danger to be apprehended from the undue enlargement of Executive patronage,) we proceed to show how the party, for whose purposes this report was made, with the Master Spirit of this committee at the head of that party, has not only not conformed in practice to its own preaching, but, instead of *diminishing* the Executive patronage, (the *not doing* which was the only charge the Senate committee ventured even to insinuate against President Adams,) has actually, within the ten or eleven years it has had possession of power, *trebled* and even *quadrupled* the degree and amount of the Executive patronage! Mr. Adams had not set himself to work to *razee* the frame of the Government as it came into his hands, and the morals of the Opposition, organized by Mr. Van Buren to his Administration, became so shocked at the danger of corruption from this source, that some expression of their delicate sensibilities upon the subject became

absolutely necessary to relieve their laboring breasts. Hence the *Report*, from which we have made the above extract, in which they disburthened themselves of their patriotic anxieties. Now let us see to what extent Mr. VAN BUREN and his friends, having full possession of power for eleven years, have *cut down* the expenses of the Government, and thereby *reduced* the extent of Executive patronage.

In this examination we follow the example of the Senate committee, in every particular. We take the city of New York, and a single branch of the federal patronage in that city, and, "to avoid mistake or error," we too limit our reference to the work "of unquestionable authority," the "Blue Book" of the Republic: and from that book, the United States' Official Register of all Officers and Agents in the service of the United States on the 30th of September, 1839, (pages 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49,) we copy the following:

*Officers of the Customs at New York.*

Jesse Hoyt,	Collector	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$1,400
J. T. Ferguson,	Deputy Collector	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
John J. Mumford,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
George Davis,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
C. P. Clinch,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
G. A. Wasson,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
Silney Wetmore,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
Talman J. Waters,	Cashier	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000
J. R. Bleeker,	Assistant Cashier	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
John A. Fleming,	Auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3,000
W. P. Holl,	Assistant Auditor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500
John W. Hunter,	do	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1,500

APPRAISERS.

Jeromus Johnson	-	2,000 00	J. Lounsberry	-	1,500 00	J. Prall	-	-	1,500 00
A. B. Mead	-	2,000 00	B. J. Messerole	-	1,500 00	P. Thomas	-	-	1,500 00
A. B. Vanderpool	-	2,000 00							

CLERKS.

R. M. Mitchell	-	1,250 00	G. D. Overton	-	900 00	G. D. Cooper	-	-	600 00
J. L. Tiffany	-	1,250 00	G. L. Oothout	-	900 00	G. W. Blake	-	-	400 00
S. H. Eakin	-	1,050 00	E. H. Plume	-	900 00	W. C. Connor	-	-	400 00
A. N. Philips	-	1,050 00	W. Fream	-	900 00	W. M. Hafl	-	-	300 00
Leonard A. Bleeker	-	1,050 00	C. Gill	-	900 00	M. Burnham	-	-	1,000 00
Elas D. Ogden	-	1,000 00	P. A. Young	-	900 00	Etam Bliss	-	-	800 00
William A. Spies	-	1,000 00	D. R. Strachan	-	900 00	Edward Bleeker	-	-	1,000 00
Nath. Alcott	-	1,050 00	C. Radcliff	-	900 00	J. E. Chadeayne	-	-	1,000 00
Wm. Lang	-	1,050 00	C. J. Cannon	-	900 00	Charles J. Chipp	-	-	1,000 00
D. Sullivan	-	1,050 00	E. L. Matthews	-	900 00	William A. Cox	-	-	1,000 00
C. Durvee	-	1,000 00	H. Doane	-	900 00	H. M. Graham	-	-	1,000 00
R. C. Overton	-	1,000 00	J. H. Roe	-	900 00	Munson Gray	-	-	1,000 00
Isaac Braxome	-	1,000 00	S. Paret	-	900 00	James H. Greenfield	-	-	1,000 00
J. Leonard	-	1,000 00	Thomas Shankland	-	900 00	John D. Hertell	-	-	1,000 00
W. J. McMaster	-	1,000 00	R. B. Adams	-	800 00	John R. S. Hugget	-	-	1,000 00
T. V. Mumford	-	1,000 00	J. C. Delmar	-	800 00	D. Kohnsat	-	-	1,000 00
Chris. A. Gardiner	-	1,000 00	J. L. S. Grandin	-	800 00	Samuel Lupton	-	-	800 00
D. Bonnet	-	1,000 00	E. Hyde	-	800 00	Daniel Monroe	-	-	1,000 00
D. Stansbury	-	1,000 00	E. G. Livingston	-	800 00	E. H. Nichols	-	-	1,000 00
John R. Hinchman	-	1,000 00	J. C. Niebuhr	-	800 00	William T. Prall	-	-	1,000 00
Leonard Wyaat	-	1,000 00	P. K. Ogden	-	800 00	Edgar Tripler	-	-	1,000 00
M. S. Swartwout	-	1,000 00	D. S. Grandin	-	800 00	George C. Tyler	-	-	1,000 00
James B. Thurston	-	1,000 00	W. B. Fremain	-	800 00	Abra Vanderpool	-	-	800 00
Wm. C. Dayton	-	1,000 00	H. Bruce	-	800 00	Adrian Van Riper	-	-	1,000 00
G. A. Brown	-	1,000 00	W. W. Fream	-	800 00	Geo. M. Wetmore	-	-	1,000 00
J. A. Bogart	-	900 00	T. H. Dennison	-	800 00	James N. Jones	-	-	1,000 00
Samuel Cadle	-	900 00	C. M. Tucker	-	800 00	Francis Vesburg	-	-	1,000 00
R. S. Newby	-	900 00	C. W. Baker	-	800 00	Chas. W. Johnson	-	-	1,000 00
J. B. Wood	-	900 00	W. A. Pearson	-	800 00	Charles H. Innes	-	-	500 00
Wm. Dempsey	-	900 00	H. Ulshoeffer	-	800 00	John H. Dunn	-	-	200 00
G. S. Brisson	-	900 00	Thomas J. Gillilan	-	800 00	W. H. Hyatt, porter	-	-	800 00
W. C. Gray	-	900 00	Frederick Schwanck	-	800 00	J. P. Hafl, messenger	-	-	250 00
H. W. Christie	-	900 00	F. C. Niebuhr	-	600 00	W. P. Hafl, do	-	-	200 00
P. V. Remsen	-	900 00	R. V. Newby	-	600 00	C. Niebuhr do	-	-	800 00
G. W. Rose	-	900 00							

INSPECTORS.

Henry Allen	-	\$1,095 00	Thomas Brownell	-	1,095 00	Amos Coles	-	-	1,095 00
Abraham Ackerman	-	1,095 00	Dennis Brink	-	1,095 00	Barnet Cole	-	-	1,095 00
Rowland P. Allen	-	1,095 00	George H. Buldle	-	1,095 00	Henry Cheavans	-	-	1,095 00
Robert Adams	-	1,095 00	Barndiss Bates	-	1,095 00	John Colvill	-	-	1,095 00
Henry C. Atwood	-	1,095 00	William Boegs	-	1,095 00	Joseph Clark	-	-	1,095 00
John Bleeker	-	1,095 00	Jefferson Brown	-	1,095 00	Peter Coutant	-	-	1,095 00
James D. Bisbet	-	1,095 00	Alum Blackledge	-	1,095 00	John Connor	-	-	1,095 00
Wm. R. Browne	-	1,095 00	William Boebe	-	1,095 00	Abraham W. Cooper	-	-	1,095 00
John J. Brown	-	1,095 00	Pascal Bertine	-	1,095 00	John Cox	-	-	1,095 00
Jacob Burdette	-	1,095 00	Alexander Bidwell	-	1,095 00	Wm. Currie	-	-	1,095 00
John Black	-	1,095 00	Samuel W. Coe	-	1,095 00	Nathan Chamberlain	-	-	1,095 00
William Benjamin	-	1,095 00	William Cairnes	-	1,095 00	Jacob J. Cohen	-	-	1,095 00

Thomas Chatterton	- 1,095 00	George Inn s	- 1,095 00	Hump. Ricketson	- 1,095 00
John Comerford	- 1,095 00	Edgar Irving	- 1,095 00	John Pierce	- 1,095 00
Patrick Caffry	- 1,095 00	Andrew Jackson	- 1,095 00	George Rocard	- 1,095 00
L. K. Campbell	- 1,095 00	Thomas Jenkins	- 1,095 00	Wm. H. Randall	- 1,095 00
Thomas Caslin	- 1,095 00	Obadiah Jackson	- 1,095 00	N. C. Robertson	- 1,095 00
John DeKamp	- 1,095 00	William D. Jones	- 1,095 00	Samuel D. Rouse	- 1,095 00
Abraham Davids	- 1,095 00	Henry Keyser	- 1,095 00	James K. Roe	- 1,795 00
Joseph Drayhouse	- 1,095 00	Robert E. Kelley	- 1,095 00	Henry Raymond	- 1,095 00
T. J. Davis	- 1,095 00	John C. Keeler	- 1,095 00	William Shute	- 1,095 00
Moran Dugan	- 1,095 00	George H. Kellinger	- 1,095 00	Charles Stuart	- 1,095 00
Abraham Dally, Jr.	- 1,095 00	William Lee	- 1,095 00	William Smith	- 1,095 00
Jeremiah Dodge	- 1,095 00	Amos Leeds	- 1,095 00	Dennis Striker	- 1,095 00
Edmund Driggs	- 1,095 00	George W. Lent	- 1,095 00	Asa H. Swift	- 1,095 00
Charles Denike	- 1,095 00	John M. Lester	- 1,095 00	Henry Storms	- 1,095 00
Thomas S. Day	- 1,095 00	H. G. Lewis	- 1,095 00	James Smyth	- 1,095 00
Darius Darling	- 1,095 00	Joseph Lyon	- 1,095 00	Henry F. Sands	- 1,095 00
A. G. Dixon	- 1,095 00	William Lupton	- 1,095 00	C. V. Schermerhorne	- 1,095 00
J. O. Dissway	- 1,095 00	Samuel Lloyd	- 1,095 00	Andrew Sure	- 1,095 00
Nathaniel Devau	- 1,095 00	John Little	- 1,095 00	Thomas S. Stevens	- 1,095 00
John J. Earle	- 1,095 00	Richard Lewis	- 1,095 00	Daniel Sparks	- 1,095 00
Anthony B. Ellison	- 1,095 00	Thomas H. Lyell	- 1,095 00	John Salmon	- 1,095 00
Joseph Ellis	- 1,095 00	P. P. Livingston	- 1,095 00	Ezbert G. Sweet	- 1,095 00
R. J. Everett	- 1,095 00	Abraham A. Legget	- 1,095 00	James Smith	- 1,095 00
John Funnar	- 1,095 00	Henry Libernau	- 1,095 00	Levi D. Slane	- 1,095 00
Henry Fanning	- 1,095 00	James Ladd	- 1,095 00	Peter Tappan	- 1,095 00
Richard Fanning	- 1,095 00	Leroy McEvers	- 1,095 00	Peter Taylor	- 1,095 00
Charles D. Field	- 1,095 00	Geo. S. Messerve	- 1,095 00	James T. Thompson	- 1,095 00
Samuel B. Fleming	- 1,095 00	Joseph Y. Miller	- 1,095 00	Andrew Tombs	- 1,095 00
Peter Field	- 1,095 00	Alexander Ming	- 1,095 00	Thomas Trenon	- 1,095 00
David Peeks	- 1,095 00	Abraham Messerole	- 1,095 00	Griffin Tompkins	- 1,095 00
F. B. Fitch	- 1,095 00	John Morris, Jr.	- 1,095 00	William Thorne	- 1,095 00
Peter Fairchild	- 1,095 00	John McGloin	- 1,095 00	James Thorne	- 1,095 00
John H. Frederick	- 1,095 00	Henry McCaddin	- 1,095 00	O. H. Tompkins	- 1,095 00
Joshua Fleet	- 1,095 00	John McKibbin	- 1,095 00	John Townsend	- 1,095 00
David Gardner	- 1,095 00	William B. Mott	- 1,095 00	Thomas W. Titus	- 1,095 00
W. H. P. Graham	- 1,095 00	Joseph Marsh	- 1,095 00	John J. Tracey	- 1,095 00
Peter Gordon	- 1,095 00	George McCready	- 1,095 00	Richard Tyson	- 1,095 00
Thos. M. Gahogan	- 1,095 00	Wm. McLaughlin	- 1,095 00	John Townsend, Jr.	- 1,095 00
Charles Green	- 1,095 00	George W. Matsell	- 1,095 00	Samuel Uter	- 1,095 00
Edmund Grass	- 1,095 00	John McGrath	- 1,095 00	B. M. Van Beuren	- 1,095 00
Nathaniel H. Green	- 1,095 00	Montgomery Messers	- 1,095 00	J. L. Van Boskerck	- 1,095 00
Frederick Groshen	- 1,095 00	John Marston	- 1,095 00	John Van Dyk	- 1,095 00
D. Henderson, Jr.	- 1,095 00	James McMillan	- 1,095 00	C. Van Antwerp	- 1,095 00
Edward Hitchcock	- 1,095 00	John J. Manning	- 1,095 00	T. B. Vermilyea	- 1,095 00
Elias Hicks	- 1,095 00	Patrick McCafferty	- 1,095 00	John W. Vethake	- 1,095 00
Wm. Honay	- 1,095 00	Donald McDonald	- 1,095 00	John Van Dine	- 1,095 00
Ward B. Howard	- 1,095 00	Charles McDermott	- 1,095 00	William Welling	- 1,095 00
D. R. Hitchcock	- 1,095 00	Wm. Marshall, Jr.	- 1,095 00	Everasius Warner	- 1,095 00
Andrew Hutton	- 1,095 00	D. McGrath	- 1,095 00	Benjamin Wood	- 1,095 00
William D. Hughes	- 1,095 00	Wm. C. Neilson	- 1,095 00	Isaac Wood	- 1,095 00
George Howard	- 1,095 00	S. C. Nicoll	- 1,095 00	Wm. J. Wiswall	- 1,095 00
John H. Hunt	- 1,095 00	Gideon Ostrander, Jr.	- 1,095 00	John W. Wheeler	- 1,095 00
Edwin A. Hopkins	- 1,095 00	James M. Oakley	- 1,095 00	W. W. Wells	- 1,095 00
Thomas Hope	- 1,095 00	Morris Oakley	- 1,095 00	M. R. Walsh	- 1,095 00
Addis n Hill	- 1,095 00	Cornelius W. Oakely	- 1,095 00	J. W. Westervelt	- 1,095 00
Charles Hunter	- 1,095 00	John Orser	- 1,095 00	J. R. Waldron	- 1,095 00
Thomas Hall	- 1,095 00	Francis Ogsburg	- 1,095 00	Thomas Wiswal	- 1,095 00
Archibald Hays	- 1,095 00	Robert Phillips	- 1,095 00	Asa W. Weldran	- 1,095 00
Thomas Howard	- 1,095 00	Naphi Phillips	- 1,095 00	Daniel Winans	- 1,095 00
David Holly	- 1,095 00	Alex. V. Phister	- 1,095 00	William Seymour	- 1,095 00
Isaac A. Isaacs	- 1,095 00	Abra. K. Patterson	- 1,095 00	Barnum Whipple	- 912 50

## NIGHT INSPECTORS.

William Angevine	- 638 75	Richard Harold	- 638 75	Michael Smith	- 638 75
William Boardman	- 638 75	J. E. Hatfield	- 638 75	Enoch Super	- 638 75
Thomas Bloomer	- 638 75	Stephen A. Kent	- 638 75	Jacob B. Mesereau	- 638 75
Francis Boss	- 638 75	Christian Kramer	- 638 75	J. Tyson	- 638 75
Bernard Conway	- 638 75	Nathaniel Ladd	- 638 75	John H. Tupster	- 638 75
Peter F. Cisco	- 638 75	James O. Ludlow	- 638 75	A. J. F. Tombs	- 638 75
James Carpenter	- 638 75	Lawrence Langton	- 638 75	Philip Tabele	- 638 75
Michael Christal	- 638 75	Robert Lawrence	- 638 75	P. G. Turish	- 638 75
Samuel Dorey	- 638 75	John McMahon	- 638 75	James Van Tassel	- 638 75
Philip Doyle	- 638 75	John McPherson	- 638 75	John Vandervoort	- 638 75
L. Dunkley	- 638 75	Charles Magness	- 638 75	A. Van Orden, jr.	- 638 75
William W. Fisher	- 638 75	Boltis McCre, jr.	- 638 75	John E. Wood	- 638 75
Thomas J. Foote	- 638 75	James Moncrief	- 638 75	Samuel Wood	- 563 87
John F. Gantz	- 638 75	Parker Muren	- 638 75	William Wason	- 638 75
Barnabas Gillespie	- 638 75	John Neafie	- 638 75	William Whitley	- 638 75
Philip Gibson	- 638 75	John Priestly	- 638 75	Zophan Wood	- 638 75
George G. Glazier	- 638 75	Alfred Palmer	- 638 75	William Woodhull	- 638 75
George Gordon	- 638 75	Frederick Roome	- 638 75	Ames Warring	- 638 75
Richard Harcourt	- 638 75	Thomas Standerwick	- 638 75	James G. Yates	- 638 75
Leonard D. House	- 638 75	William Spreight	- 638 75	G. B. Woldridge	- 638 75
Peter Hull	- 638 75	Charles K. Smith	- 638 75		



## WEIGHERS.\*

Alexander Bleeker	- 1,543 56	Thomas Hazard	- 1,261 42	John M. Pattison	- 3,132 50
Jeremiah Brower	- 2,537 64	Step. B. Hoffmam	- 2,582 82	David Poore	- 2,156 77
William E. Cruger	- 1,134 40	Thomas Kirk	- 1,996 00	George Sibell	- 3,463 06
E. H. De Camp	- 1,796 05	Lewis Loutrel	- 2,560 02	John Sickles	- 2,036 82
Robert Dumont	- 3,870 15	Charles Mills	- 2,516 77	James Westervelt	- 2,317 99
John Franklin	- 2,254 21	John W. Oakley	- 1,866 69		

## GAUGERS.\*

Benjamin Fuller	- 3,083 44	Alex. Ming, jr.	- 2,285 43	John Tuomy	- 2,343 05
Thomas W. Garniss	- 1,150 13	Elias Nexsen, jr.	- 2,115 65	Edward C. Thruston	- 1,066 60
A. C. Houghton	- 2,332 51	William Ryer	- 2,723 42	A. J. Walker	- 3,059 09
Thomas Morris	- 1,063 62	Henry E. Riell	- 2,625 12	T. P. Walworth	- 8,960 50

## MEASURERS.\*

John Alwaise	- 2,013 54	Joseph Hopkins	- 1,615 31	Alfred G. Stevens	- 1,110 16
Jacob D. Clute	- 1,911 74	G. W. McPherson	- 1,820 88	John M. Thorne	- 1,829 92
William Durell	- 1,780 72	George Nixon	- 1,553 11	J. B. Vanderpool	- 1,779 47
J. W. Forbes	- 1,712 83	Lemuel Pittman	- 1,925 64	Jacob M. Vreeland	- 1,829 10
Edmund Fitch	- 1,683 97	J. J. B. Rowan	- 1,738 82	E. J. McCarthy	- 753 63
W. M. Hitchcock	- 1,734 18	J. W. Richardson	- 1,677 03	Garrit T. Bratt	- 47 49
William Hagodon	- 1,836 49	Henry C. Sperry	- 1,664 41	Robert Gourlay	- 1,767 00

G. H. Richards, Deputy Inspector of Revenue or Marker	-	-	-	-	\$1,637 00
Marcus Sears do	-	-	-	-	1,285 65
Allan M. Sniffen do	-	-	-	-	1,829 65
John J. Plume, Assistant Collector	-	-	-	-	1,000 00
Hiram Perry, Surveyor	-	-	-	-	150 00
Ely Moore, Surveyor	-	-	-	-	2,900 00
S. Brewster, Deputy Surveyor	-	-	-	-	1,500 00
Andrew A. Jones, Chief Clerk	-	-	-	-	1,150 00
E. H. Sears, Second Clerk	-	-	-	-	1,150 00
Charles F. Lineback, Third Clerk	-	-	-	-	850 00
William Froment, Fourth Clerk	-	-	-	-	1,000 00
James W. Carpenter, Fifth Clerk	-	-	-	-	70 00
R. Davenport, Messenger and Porter	-	-	-	-	600 00
William S. Coe, Naval Officer	-	-	-	-	3,000 00
George W. Coe, Deputy Naval Officer	-	-	-	-	1,500 00

## CLERKS.

Elias B. Dayton	- 1,200	Wade Hough	- 1,050	Timothy F. Cooke	- 900
John Cockle	- 1,050	Abijah Ingraham	- 1,050	Joseph Crosthwaite	- 900
M. W. Van Dyck	- 1,050	Joshua S. Bowne	- 900	Jeremiah Green	- 600
Samuel Van Wyck	- 1,050	John V. Largee	- 900	Richard Kidney, jr	- 600
Samson M. Isaacks	- 1,050	Francis D. Swords	- 900	John H. Robins	- 375
George W. Gantz	- 1,050	Wm. C. Thompson	- 900	W. B. Rhodes, Porter	- 300
Samuel H. Moore	- 1,050				

"A formidable list, indeed!" as said Mr. BENTON and his committee in 1826 of the List of Officers of that day. An astounding list! say we. Look at the regiment of names comprised in the above enumeration! Look at the great amount of public money distributed among them! Compare this exhibit with that of the vilified (and falsified) Administration of Mr. ADAMS, and mark the difference! In Mr. ADAMS's time the whole number of officers employed in the collection of the customs (excluding the officers of the revenue cutter and the light-house keepers, not included in the late enumeration) was *one hundred and sixty-six*, and the aggregate amount of their compensations about *one hundred and twenty thousand dollars*: on the 20th of September last, the number of officers employed in the same duty was, as the reader will discover by counting them, *FOUR HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-EIGHT*, and the amount of their salaries (in round numbers) about *FIVE HUNDRED AND FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS*.† Here we have an arithmetical demonstration of the true difference of value between profession and practice—between the *aristocracy* and *extravagance* of the Administration of Mr. J. Q. ADAMS, and the *democracy* and *severe economy* of that of Mr. VAN BUREN. Do politicians ever blush? Do they ever hang their heads for shame? After this exposition of the utter falsity of all the pretensions of his party, how dare any SPOILS-MAN look an honest People in the face!

We will, however, spare the reader any commentary of our own upon the profusion and waste of public money which is disclosed in the preceding statement; nor will we detain him by expatiating upon the obvious intent and purpose of such a multiplication of pensioners upon the Government in the city of New York, where parties are known to be

[\* The sums to the Weighers, Gaugers, Measurers, and Markers are here put down agreeably to the returns of those officers for the fees on the cargoes of vessels which arrived during the year; but each officer of his class receives an equal division of the aggregate amount of fees of that class.

† So far, as it observed, from this increase of Government patronage and expenditure being demanded by an augmentation of the customs, the reverse is the fact. The revenue from the customs has greatly fallen off since 1826.

so nearly divided that the addition or reduction of a score or two of custom-house officers might sometimes decide the fate of an election. We find a *commentary before the fact* in the remarks with which Mr. BEXTON accompanied his exposition of the dangers of Executive patronage, at a time when it was at least kept within some bounds. No one can read the following passages of the Report without being struck by the wonderfully prophetic spirit which pervades them:

"To be able to show to the Senate a full and perfect view of the power and workings of Federal patronage, the committee addressed a note, immediately after they were charged with this inquiry, to each of the Departments, and to the Postmaster General, requesting to be informed of the whole number of persons employed, and the whole amount of money paid out, under the direction of their respective departments. The answers received are herewith submitted, and made part of this report. With the BLUE BOOK, they will discover enough to show that the predictions of those who were not blind to the defects of the Constitution are ready to be realized; that the power and influence of *Federal* patronage, contrary to the argument in the '*Federalist*,' is an overmatch for the power and influence of *State* patronage; that its workings will contaminate the purity of all elections, and enable the Federal Government, eventually, to govern throughout the States, as effectually as if they were so many provinces of one vast empire.

"The whole of this great power will centre in the President. The King of England is the 'fountain of honor;' the President of the United States is the source of patronage. He presides over the entire system of Federal appointments, jobs, and contracts. He has 'power' over the 'support' of the individuals who administer the system. He makes and unmakes them. He chooses from the circle of his friends and supporters, and may dismiss them; and, upon all the principles of human action, will dismiss them, as often as they disappoint his expectations. His spirit will animate their actions in all the elections to State and Federal offices. There may be exceptions, but the truth of a general rule is proved by the exception. The intended check and control of the Senate, without new constitutional or statutory provisions, will cease to operate. Patronage will penetrate this body, subdue its capacity of resistance, chain it to the car of power, and enable the President to rule as easily, and much more securely with, than without, the nominal check of the Senate. If the President was himself the officer of the People, elected by them, and responsible to them, there would be less danger from this concentration of all power in his hands; but it is the business of statesmen to act upon things as they are, and not as they would wish them to be. We must then look forward to the time when the public revenue will be doubled: when the civil and military officers of the Federal Government will be quadrupled, [they have been already all but quadrupled without waiting for the increase of revenue:] when its influence over individuals will be multiplied to an indefinite extent; when the nomination by the President can carry any man through the Senate, and his recommendation can carry any measure through the two Houses of Congress; when the principle of public action will be open and avowed, the President wants my vote, and I want his patronage; I will vote as he wishes, and he will give me the office I wish for. What will this be but the Government of one man? and what is the Government of one man but a *monarchy*? Names are nothing. The nature of a thing is in its substance, and the name soon accustoms itself to the substance."

"Those who make the President must support him. Their political fate becomes identified, and they must stand or fall together. Right or wrong, they must support him; and if he is made contrary to the will of the people, he must be supported not only by votes and speeches, but by arms."

We have thus seen, by one illustration, what sort of confidence is due to the professions, by the ruling party in the Government, of *democracy, economy, &c.* Nor will it be in the power of the party to shelter itself behind Congress, and, as is their wont, throw the blame on the Legislature for having forced this expenditure upon the Executive against its will. This is an expenditure which Congress has had no hand in. It is one for which Congress is not called upon to make appropriations, because the salaries are *paid out of the revenue before it reaches the Treasury*. This list of officeholders, therefore, with its long array of salaries and emoluments, never passes under the review of Congress at all. The compensation of Inspectors, Weighers, &c., is indeed fixed by law, but the number is dependent on the unrestrained will and pleasure of the Executive; no account is rendered to Congress whether, after being appointed and salaried, they really do daily duty in their places, or spend their time in electioneering to maintain their employers in power. Some of them, it is notorious, perform little more official duty than the signing receipts for their salaries, their more important duties being those of taking care of the interests of "the party" at home and abroad, the city of New York being too narrow a field for their useful labors. Education to and adaption for their ostensible employments are by no means indispensable requisites for employments in the custom-house. If they had been, SAMUEL SWARTWOUT would never, by having the grave and highly responsible office of Collector of the port of New York thrust upon him, have been subjected to the temptation of embezzling for his share a million and a quarter of dollars of the public money.

Nor is it by their personal services and influence alone that the officers of the customs are expected to help "the party" at the polls. Of the amount received from the public chest in the shape of emoluments of office they are expected to pay back into the party fund a *pro rata* amount for electioneering purposes. This was in evidence before the committee appointed two years ago to investigate the defalcations in the New York Custom-house; and, as readers are apt to forget things which they have only casually or cursorily read, we turn to the report of that investigation, in order to refresh the reader's memory by the following extracts from the evidence taken before the committee, establishing the fact of the taxation for party operations to which the custom-house officers in New York are subjected.



## ARENT S. DEPEYSTER examined.

Question. While you were connected with the custom-house, do you know whether or not the officers of the customs were called upon to pay any part of their salaries, or any assessment or tax thereon, for party or political purposes? If yes, state whether you have ever, and when you have, made any such payment; and state the motive upon which such payments were made.

Answer. The weighers were called on to pay fifteen dollars each for the support of the election; and when I declined, Mr. Vanderpoel, the deputy surveyor, observed that I ought to consider whether my \$1,500 per annum was not worth paying fifteen dollars for. Under the impression that it was the price of my situation, I paid it. The above occurred during the last spring election for charter officers.

During my holding office, for about five years, I was occasionally called on, but always declined until within the last two years.

Question. Do you know whether other subordinate officers besides yourself, in the custom-house, were called on and required to pay such tax or assessment upon their salaries, for the use of party and political purposes?

Answer. Only by hearsay, as it regards the other officers; but I saw many of the weighers pay the tax of fifteen dollars.

Question. Was the money thus collected from you and others to be used for political purposes? If yes, for which of the then and present political parties?

Answer. It was intended to be used to support the election of persons attached to the present administration.

## ABRAHAM B. VANDERPOEL examined.

Question. Do you know whether the officers of the custom-house have ever been called on to contribute sums of money to party and political objects? what officers have been so called on; by whom, for what amount; with or without regard to their salaries of office; when did they contribute; if they refused, was any intimation given that their refusal might occasion their removal; what amount has been so contributed or collected, and for the support of what party, at any one election?

This interrogatory was objected to by Mr. Foster.

Mr. Foster called for the yeas and nays.

The question, Shall the interrogatory be propounded? was put, and decided in the affirmative.

Yeas—Messrs. Curtis, Dawson, Harlan, Smith, Wise—5.

Nays—Messrs. Foster, Owens, Wagener—3.

Other proceedings were had, in regard to which Mr. Wise offered the following resolution.

Resolved, That the following facts be entered on the journal:

Mr. Wise propounded to the witness, Abraham B. Vanderpoel, the following question, to wit:

Question. Do you know whether the officers of the custom-house have ever been called on to contribute sums of money to party and political objects; what officers have so been called upon; by whom, for what amount; with or without regard to their salaries of office; when did they contribute; if they refused, was any intimation given that their refusal might occasion their removal; what amount has so been contributed or collected, and for the support of what party, at any one election?

The witness took the interrogatory, without objection to propounding the same, and proceeded to write his answer thereto on the paper attached to the question; and had written the following, to wit:

"I have known officers attached to the custom-house to have been called on for"—when Mr. Owens, member of the committee, interposed and informed the witness that he was not bound to answer a *vis interrogatory* relating to his private affairs; and thereupon Mr. Foster, another member of the committee, objected to propounding the interrogatory. The witness here commenced to tear off what he had written before objection was made to the interrogatory. Mr. Wise prevented him from doing so, by fortifying the act. Mr. Foster insisted that the witness had the right to tear off what he had written, and that it was not his answer until it was complete and handed in, and he asked the witness whether it was his answer, and he replied, "it was not;" and the committee having decided that the interrogatory should be propounded, the said question by Mr. Wise was again handed to the witness, and he returned the following: "I decline to answer the 2d question." The witness was then permitted to retire.

Mr. Curtis called for the yeas and nays; and the resolution was adopted.

Yeas—Messrs. Curtis, Dawson, Foster, Harlan, Owens, Smith, Wagener, Wise—8.

Nays—None.

## DAVID S. LYON examined.

Question. Whilst you were deputy collector at the port of New York, were you ever called on, as an officer of the custom-house, to contribute any sum or sums of money to party or political objects? If so, what amount? Was such amount, from you, called for in consideration of your salary from Government? What proportion did it bear to your salary? Did you pay it? If not, why not? Who called for such contributions? Were other subordinates in the custom-house, to your knowledge, called on to contribute in like manner? For the support of what party were these contributions called for? Was any menace, directly or indirectly, of removal held over these officers or yourself, for failures to grant such contributions?

Mr. Owens objected to the interrogatory.

The question, Shall the interrogatory be propounded? was put, and decided in the affirmative, the yeas and nays having been called for by Mr. Owens.

Yeas—Messrs. Curtis, Dawson, Harlan, Smith, Wise—5.

Nays—Messrs. Owens, Wagener—2.

Answer. I have frequently been called on to contribute to political objects while I was deputy collector, as an officer of the custom-house. The amount was from twenty dollars to one hundred dollars. The tax was *pro rata*, according to salary. It bore a proportion of from one to six per cent. I frequently paid a part of the amount; when it was too high, and more than I could afford, I urged them to reduce it. In one instance, where I was assessed twenty dollars, Mr. Swartwout told the collector of the tax that ten dollars was enough for me to pay. For a few years back I have not paid anything to the general committee, because I could not afford to pay the amount assessed, and because I could not conscientiously longer sustain the party. The collectors of the Tammany Hall general committee, one of whom was John Becker, called on me several times. William Lyack once or twice called on me to collect the amount with which I was assessed; he was not the regular collector, but was one of the general committee. I believe that nearly all the officers of the custom-house, in doors and out, and the clerks, were similarly taxed, and generally paid what they were assessed. It was assessed by the general committee of Tammany Hall, and for the support of the party denominated the Tammany Hall party. If the individual did not pay the amount he was taxed with, the collector would remark, "You will be reported to the general committee;" and every body well understood that prescription would follow. The collector of the general committee has an alphabetical book, which contains the names of persons taxed, and the amount each individual is required to pay.

We have confined our examination of the growth and extent of Executive patronage under our present and late rulers to the New York Custom-house, only because it was the

case selected for illustration by themselves fourteen years ago. We have little doubt that correspondent extravagance would, upon examination, be found to exist in other branches of the public service. In the Indian Department, for example, it is believed the most corrupt practices have prevailed, and the most extravagant and wasteful expenditures have been made, especially in the making and executing of treaties. At this moment, it is asserted, there are hundreds of thousands of dollars of Indian appropriations unaccounted for, in the hands of individuals, who have had the gratuitous use of it, some of them for a number of years.

But Mr. BENTON'S committee did not confine themselves exclusively to the expenditures of the New York Custom house. They obtained from the several great public offices at the seat of Government accounts of their contingent expenditures, in printing and advertising, &c. Upon these they did not, in their report, pass any direct censure. Nor, in truth, was there any room for it. Under no Administration up to that of General JACKSON, had the Executive patronage of the press been regarded as the means of purchasing, hiring, or retaining political partisans. A certain amount of printing and advertising was done under the orders of different public offices, because it was indispensable to the conduct of the public business, and it was paid for at no higher or other rates than individuals are obliged to pay for similar services. Except in an honorary point of view, the custom of the Government was, for a great many years after our first acquaintance with it, any thing but desirable to publishers of newspapers.

Mr. BENTON and Mr. VAN BUREN had, however, in all probability, other views of this matter, when they called for the names of all printers employed to do business for the different public offices, with the amounts paid to each, (which were not then, as they now are, included in the Blue Book.) It is certain, at least, that other views of the subject were entertained by the political confederates of those gentlemen in the year following, when a debate of three weeks' duration took place upon the expediency of changing the mode of designating the newspapers in which the laws shall be published; it being by law, at that time, as it is now, and with obvious propriety, the duty of the Secretary of State to make such designation. The number of publishers of the laws to be so designated was and still is fixed by law; and the amount of compensation (also fixed by law) which so roused the jealousy of the pretended democracy of that day as to incite them to a systematic war upon it, does not exceed an average of one hundred dollars a year for each press, not more than is annually paid by many persons in the private ways and walks of life for their individual advertising.

This enormous patronage of the press savored too much of Executive influence for the taste of the disinterested patriots in Congress, who had combined their wits to wrest the "barren sceptre" of power from the hands of Mr. ADAMS, and turn it to a more profitable use in their own. It is even supposed that the allusion in the Inaugural Address of General JACKSON to "the patronage of the Government" being brought "in conflict with the freedom of elections" had reference to this branch of Executive patronage; an idea ludicrous enough, certainly, when we consider for a moment what was afterwards the practice of his administration, from its first start, when he appointed AMOS KENDALL and other party printers to some of the best offices of the Government, down to his testamentary act on retiring from office, by which he imposed as a duty upon his successor in office the patronage and support of the press which he had established at the seat of Government, and supported by the means of Executive patronage lavished upon it by every conduit under his control. However that may be, the alleged danger to public liberty from the immense patronage of the press wielded by the Secretary of State became, in the early part of the year 1827, the subject of one of the most excited debates that had ever occurred in the Representative Chamber. The ground of the debate thus brought on by the Opposition of that day was the fact that the Secretary of State had changed the publishers of the laws in ten cases out of the whole list of publishers, which was seventy-nine.

It is truly ludicrous, again, that the House of Representatives,

"Like Ocean into tempest toss'd"

"To waft a feather or to drown a fly,"

should have been thrown into a ferment by so moderate an exercise of his legal discretion by the Secretary of State, when it is notorious that these same pretended democrats, when they got into power, changed the entire list of publishers of laws with a single dash of the pen, and would as soon have thought of being inoculated with the plague as of employing any man in any trust in the Government who was not as *purely* democratic as themselves. But so it was. On the 1st of February, 1827, came up for consideration the following resolution, moved by Mr. SAUNDERS, of North Carolina, (the discomfited candidate for Governor of that State at the late election:)

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State communicate to this House a list of such of the newspapers in each of the States in which the laws of Congress were directed to be published in the years 1825 and 1826. Also, a list of such in which the laws are directed to be published in 1827, designating the changes which have been made, and the reason for each change."

In support of this resolution Mr. SANDERS affirmed that "the gentleman now at the head of the State Department has been *guilty* of selecting papers more for political and personal objects than to give the greatest publicity to the laws," &c. This was the gist of the argument of the opposition throughout the debate.

"The effect of such a course of things (Mr. SANDERS said) was calculated to operate, not only on those who now print the laws, but on all those who might have any desire to print them. By seeing those rewarded who had shown the most zeal in promoting the Secretary's views, they would naturally be taught to infer that if they displayed a zeal still more ardent they should have it conferred upon them."

"It was thus calculated to operate, and did actually operate, so far as it went, to control the freedom of the press, and to enlist throughout the country that powerful instrument in behalf of the views of the State Department. In this respect it was much more effectual and *much more dangerous than the far-famed alien and sedition laws*. The provisions of those laws were direct and tangible. They were open and seen of all; but the power to which he alluded operated directly, but was not seen so to operate."

It was the opinion of the party leaders of that day that the Executive was bound to give reasons for appointments and removals from office. [How utterly repugnant to the notions of the same party, now in power!]

"If (said Mr. HORTON in this debate) the head of the Department has any cause to show which will justify the course—the very extraordinary course—he has adopted, the House will, no doubt, be satisfied; and doubtless if he has such reasons to produce, he will not hesitate to lay them before us. But if he is to remain totally irresponsible—if his robe is not so much as to be touched—if his person is sanctified, and he has all the infallibility of the Pope—then, sir, let this House and this People talk no longer of their privileges."

Mr. POLK (now Governor of Tennessee) took an active part in this *great* debate. He was particularly indignant that the Secretary of State should have taken his patronage of a hundred dollars a year from one publisher in Tennessee and given it to another, &c.

"Though we have no alien and sedition laws, (said Mr. POLK,) are we to have what is tantamount to them? Are the public functionaries of the Government to be wrapt up in the robes of office, and to be held irresponsible to the People or the People's Representatives? And are all those who have firmness and independence enough fearlessly to inquire into the conduct of public men, and the manner in which the public money is expended, to be denounced, by the partisans and servile adherents of the House that now reigns, as factious oppositionists?"

Mr. HORTON, however, next to Mr. SANDERS, seems to have been the chief speaker on the opposition side in this debate. In reply to the very natural astonishment expressed by some of the Republicans, that so violent a storm should have raged during the morning hours of three whole weeks upon so insignificant a provocation, Mr. H. spoke as follows:

"But gentlemen affect no wonder how it happens that this is the only vigilant opposition which has had for its object the reform of the Government. He asks, where stood the sentinels on the ramparts in times past? Sir, there never existed, before the present, a more momentous period to the American people. There never was a greater necessity for resisting the encroachments of Executive power, which attempts to prostrate, by the voice of its organs on this floor, every vestige of State independence which cannot be sapped by more secret means. Sir, when sovereign States of this Union are openly threatened, in their legislative capacity, and the Representatives of States openly admonished on this floor that if they act it will be at their peril; thus, sir, when all of liberty that cannot be undermined by the VAST AND STILL SWELLING TIDE OF EXECUTIVE PATRONAGE is to be overcome by open violence, have we not abundant reason to look out from the watch-tower?"

Of this debate we have quoted enough to show the great alarm manifested by the opponents of the Adams Administration at the extent of Executive patronage, in connexion with the press, and their invincible repugnance to any use of that patronage which could, by any *presumption*, be traced to a party motive.

Let us next see what was the actual extent of expenditure, at the time referred to, under the direction of Executive officers, for newspapers, advertising and printing. In this case, as in the case of the Custom-house expenditures, we prefer, with Mr. BENTON's committee, to select a single department of the Government for examination; and, in making the selection, we make choice of that one in which the expenditures were entirely discretionary, and regulated and controlled by no law. We mean the POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Among the documents obtained from the several Departments, and presented to the Senate by the committee to show the extent of Executive patronage, was a report from Postmaster General McLEAN, dated 8th of March, 1826, from which we make the following extract:

"The printing of the Department, not including the publication of proposals for mail contracts, in the year 1823, amounted to \$2,567 52; in the following year to \$2,973 45; and in the year 1825, to \$3,466 45. In this year, the amount was greatly increased by the printing of about ten thousand pamphlets, containing a statement of the Post Offices, &c., and about the same number of the Post Office laws, instructions, &c.

"The amount paid for the publication of proposals, as also the papers in which such publications were made, will appear from the papers enclosed, to which the committee are respectfully referred."



*List of Post Offices where advertisements were published, by order of the Postmaster General, in 1825.*

Post Offices.	Name of Newspaper or Publisher.	Amount paid.
Cahawba, Alabama - -	Account not rendered.	
Columbia, South Carolina - -	Telescope - -	\$35 32
Frankfort, Kentucky - -	Dana and Halerman - -	63 37½
Indianapolis, Indiana - -	Douglas and Maguire - -	20 00
Jackson, Mississippi - -	Account not rendered.	
Jefferson city, Missouri - -	Ditto.	
Little Rock, Arkansas Territory - -	Ditto.	
Milledgeville, Georgia - -	Camak and Ragland - -	43 75
Murfreesboro', Tennessee - -	Account not rendered.	
Raleigh, North Carolina - -	Raleigh Register - -	40 00
Richmond, Virginia - -	Account not rendered.	
Pensacola, Florida Territory - -	Pensacola Gazette - -	45 00
Vincennes, Indiana - -	Elisha Stout - -	32 00
Annapolis, Maryland - -	Account not rendered.	
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania - -	in Pa. Intelligencer, 3d qr. - -	39 00
Trenton, New Jersey - -	in Tren. T. American, do. - -	12 00
Washington City - -	{ National Intelligencer - -	690 00
	{ National Journal - -	714 00
Albany, New York - -	Daily Ad. & Gaz., 3d qr. - -	66 30
Canandaigua, New York - -	D. C. Miller - -	80 50
	J. A. Stevens - -	80 50
Boston, Massachusetts - -	Patriot, 3d qr. - -	18 75
Columbus, Ohio - -	Ohio Monitor, 3d qr. - -	29 25
Concord, New Hampshire - -	Account not rendered.	
Dover, Delaware - -	Ditto.	
Montpelier, Vermont - -	E. P. Walton, pub., 3d qr. - -	19 05
Portland, Maine - -	Todd & Smith, do do - -	18 75
Harford, Connecticut - -	Goodwin & Co. do do - -	11 20
		<hr/> \$2,056 67

The expense of *printing* for three years preceding 1826, it appears, amounted to \$12,007 42—or, averaging the years, to \$4,002 47 (say four thousand dollars) a year. The cost of *advertising* for the single year immediately preceding 1826 was \$2,056 67—the greater part of that sum being paid for the long advertisement of Proposals for carrying the mails, published annually in two newspapers at the seat of Government. This was the whole extent of Executive patronage dispensed to the press through the agency of the Post Office Department at the date of Mr. BENTON's report. Yet this amount of expenditure for *advertising* was regarded with so jealous and distrustful an eye by Messrs. BENTON and VAN BUREN, that of the objects proposed by the *bills* which that committee reported for the purpose of “trimming down the powers of the Executive by statutory enactments,” one was “to regulate the publication of *public advertisements*.”

Let us now turn to the Blue Book, and see what *reduction* in this description of public expenditure has been effected under the administration of Mr. VAN BUREN, and how far by such reduction the sphere of Executive influence has been contracted. And what do we find in reference to this matter in the Blue Book! We could hardly credit the evidence of our own senses; and our readers, we are sure, will partake of our astonishment when they read the following account of the *frugal* and *economical* rate of expenditure, for advertising, especially, which has been substituted by this *democratic* Administration for the pretended extravagance and prodigality of the *aristocratic* Administration upon whose fall Mr. VAN BUREN rose into power. Here is the proof of it:

## FROM THE OFFICIAL REGISTER.

*Names of all Printers employed by the Post Office Department, with the Compensation allowed to each, for one year, ending 30th September last.*

## [Amount paid for advertising.]

S. Eichelberger	\$843 50	Marston & Barker	\$30 34	H. C. Bunce	\$35 00
Park & Rogers	701 25	Quartus Graves	31 19	Jas. Clark & Co.	27 50
Guieu & Thompson	564 77	Thomas Loring	23 75	A. Huger	7 80
Gaines & Murray	120 00	A. Greenleaf, jr.	32 55	Byers & Jordan	55 75
William Walters	42 00	Rix & Whitmore	26 91	J. Glossner	5 00
H. B. Grigsby	25 00	J. S. C. Knowlton	6 00	E. Devalcourt	30 00
D. Brown	175 50	Osborn & Baldwin	33 40	L. Eichelberger	45 00
H. A. Mitchell	7 21	L. E. Thompson	2 00	J. Bowyer	40 00
Miffin & Parry	32 75	L. & F. Gifford	19 00	James Hagan	50 00
Hollis & Bennett	3 75	P. Dean Carrique	31 35	Edward Cole	33 75
Baizer & Farmer	116 50	Britt & Brown	33 00	W. W. Leland	17 50
P. Allen & Son	4 00	Wm. C. Bryant	45 00	P. W. Ganter, jr.	45 00
Thomas Ritchie	36 00	O. H. Wells	24 37	Guieu & Thompson	34 12
Thomas Loring	35 00	Albon Chase	40 04	C. Bayn & Wagner	105 00
D. Blucker	4 00	R. H. Stanton	35 62	F. S. Myer	225 15
Park & Rogers	76 50	Geo. R. Weber	25 00	T. Sanford	840 00
Beals & Green	45 62	Smith & Robinson	41 42	Messenger & Rollston	15 00
H. Baues	34 13	Beals & Green	10 00	Webb & Hutchinson	35 75
Jas. H. Campbell	85 00	Joe. F. Hubbard	50 00	H. Beese	75 00
D. Eichelberger	31 25	Leitch & Gillock	25 00	Isaac Snow	10 00
Nathan Hale	12 75	Pray & Thompson	32 27	P. B. Ankeny	205 00
I. N. Cardozo	609 68	Wm. B. Anderson	81 50	Ramsay & Crumhead	1 00
H. A. Mitchell	27 50	Joel M. Smith	48 33	E. Kinsbury, jr.	337 50
Morrill & Dinsmore	4 00	Daniel Bradford	51 37	J. G. & T. J. McLain	4 16
John Busk	19 50	Wm. Walters	90 00	Ott & Weber	132 75
M. Spooner	7 25	J. Wentworth	69 75	Wm. B. Anderson	48 75
David Brown	52 50	Karnes & Bussett	91 05	Harker & Busk	210 37
H. B. Grigsby	45 00	D. W. Whitehurst	22 50	John M. Spencer	619 25
Forsyth & Kilby	232 50	W. W. Leland	72 50	A. H. Pemberton	80 60
Guieu & Thompson	65 84	Jno. M. Tillotson	20 80	J. Livingston	780 00
W. C. Bryant & Co.	31 50	Campbell & Wilson	45 00	G. S. Gilbert	10 00
Thomas Loring	18 75	W. H. Gray	95 00	Wm. & Geo. Johnson	85 00
Edward J. Hale	12 00	Brown & Lindsay	57 50	J. S. Justice & Son	133 50
L. E. Thompson	33 25	Noonan & Sholes	25 00	Miffin & Parry	75 00
Peun & Elliot	36 50	G. S. Gilbert	15 00	J. P. Macgill	565 25
W. E. Woodruff	12 50	Joseph Justice	45 50	Jack & McElroy	757 00
R. C. Green	6 25	Branam & Hatiday	72 50	Geo. W. Sherwood	142 75
Geo. W. Wood	10 00	Thomas Ritchie	45 00	Dawson & Fisher	587 12
W. A. Hawley	3 50	Benj. Hayes	50 62	D. K. Lightner	259 00
D. C. Goodale & J. Cobb	13 55	Edw. Cole	52 50	C. B. H. Fessenger	182 25
Lawson Gifford	25 00	J. Livingston	40 00	Joseph Pough	133 00
C. E. Bartlett	60 00	Cyrus Barton	36 00	T. B. Crawford	133 00
Knowles & Hutchins	210 00	Bishop & Winslow	26 25	S. & M. H. Medary	614 25
Jno. C. Huswell	90 00	Prentiss & Weisinger, Penn & Elliot,	21 00	Boas & Coplan	761 50
English, Brown & Lind	10 00	and J. E. Brown		A. H. & W. F. Pemberton	3 15
Wm. F. Woodruff	25 00	Zim & Miller	51 00	J. W. Shugart	594 75
Jno. A. Stuart	37 85	Hale & Eaton	70 00	A. S. Willington & Co.	27 30
P. Allen & Son	28 67	Mitchell & Burr	53 47	E. Stout & Son	5 00
Holden & Appleton	35 00	P. Woods, jr.	62 50	McGomph & Dinick	611 25
Fisk & Cunningham	36 25	Penn & Elliot	97 75		

## [Amount paid for printing blanks.]

S. Medary & Bros	\$1,949 23	Paine & Clark	\$738 45	F. S. Myer	\$197 10
Miffin & Parry	561 25	James Rice, jr.	319 12	F. S. Myer	68 40
Beals & Green	2,161 41	S. Penn, jr.	555 83	Miffin & Parry	541 25
Cyrus Barton	556 11	J. Elliot	500 00	Beals & Green	1,706 37
S. Penn, jr.	435 67	Miffin & Parry	845 75	S. Medary & Bros	1,857 50
Paine & Clark	833 02	S. Medary & Bros.	1,079 67	Cyrus Barton	715 45
James Rice	19 50	Beals & Green	1,634 80	Paine & Clark	549 20
Miffin & Parry	450 87	S. Penn, jr.	190 00	F. S. Myer	81 00
Beals & Green	1,846 00	Paine & Clark	713 23	S. Penn, jr.	533 00
Cyrus Barton	645 10	Cyrus Barton	630 07	F. S. Myer	168 00
S. Medary & Bros	1,642 24	James Rice	371 25	S. Penn, jr.	489 95
S. Penn, jr.	271 00	S. Penn, jr.	556 78		

[NOTE. This list, large as it is, must yet be incomplete, the amount of printing and advertising by the publishers of the Globe being entirely omitted. The reader must be content to imagine that amount, as well as other probable omissions, and add to the rest.]

Whatever may be held back in the composition of this part of the Blue Book, by accident or by contrivance, (such, for instance, as suspending the payment of accounts until after the *list* was made out for "the book,") enough is disclosed to show a prodigal use of the public money for the purpose of establishing or pensioning party presses. Of all the names of persons who have received the public money for advertising during the past year, how many are known, even to those of their own vocation, as publishers of newspapers of any such circulation as would recommend or even justify the Department in publishing its advertisements in them? It is not to be doubted that a Post Office advertisement, yielding



an emolument of from two or three to seven or eight hundred dollars, would be an acceptable annual gratification to the printer of any weekly paper of a circulation of three or four hundred papers, confined, perhaps, to the limits of a single county: it cannot be doubted that upon the inducement of such a *douceur* (sufficient to pay the whole annual expenditure of such a paper) a subservient party press might be established where none existed before; but who is there that will undertake to justify such employment of the public money, under the pretence of advertising for proposals for contracts for carrying the mail in parts of the country where perhaps none but a weekly horse-mail is to be carried, or in those in which the Post Office call for proposals is already abundantly circulated through the regular official channel? It is too plain, upon the face of this list, to be susceptible of doubt, in the mind of those at least who have any general knowledge of the public press, that the greater part of the above disbursements of the public money are in reality *for party purposes*, and for no other. In many an instance, we have no doubt, (we may almost say, we *know*,) nothing is known at the Post Office of these expenditures but that some member of Congress, or some influential personage not in Congress, has *advised* such an application of the public money, the intent of it being to confirm a wavering, or to sustain a tottering, press. Of the amount paid for printing blanks, the reader will perceive at a glance, the most considerable sums of money have been all paid to the publishers of the most zealous party papers in different populous cities.

Every reader will be contented, we presume, with this evidence of the *sincerity* of Mr. VAN BUREN and his friends in both Houses of Congress in their expressions of alarm at the extent of the Executive patronage in 1826, and in their clamor for reform, and especially for "the correction of those abuses which have brought the patronage of the Government in conflict with the freedom of elections."

Out upon such hypocrisy!

But the most serious objection taken by the Van Buren party (of 1826) in the House of Representatives was, that the enormous patronage of one hundred dollars a year (a bare equivalent, if so much, for the actual labor required) to each publisher of the laws had been employed by the Executive with the intent to favor the friends of the Administration; inasmuch as, in one year, 1825, as appeared by one of the documents accompanying Mr. Benton's Report, the publication of the laws had been transferred from one newspaper to another in ten cases out of the whole number (being seventy-nine.) It was the principle, and not the amount involved in this fact, which in their opinion endangered the liberties of the country. Yes, it was the principle of *removal from office* which most offended their delicate olfactories. 'This abuse must be reformed, said they:

"Th' offence is rank, and smells to Heaven."

And how, when soon afterwards, by means of this clamor and these pretences, they came into power—these sensitive patriots, who had snuffed corruption "in the tainted gale"—how did they reform this particular abuse? Let us see.

Besides removing all the high Cabinet Ministers, which was done on the first day after the inauguration of President, (and to which no exception is taken,) the Jackson-Van Buren Administration, by removals from office, within that year, filled with its own political friends and partisans the following offices, viz:

Minister Plenipotentiary to Colombia.*	Secretary of Legation to Colombia.
Minister Plenipotentiary to Great Britain.	First Assistant Postmaster General.
Minister Plenipotentiary to France.	Second Assistant Postmaster General.
Minister Plenipotentiary to the Netherlands.	Second Comptroller of the Treasury.
Minister Plenipotentiary to Spain.	Second Auditor of the Treasury.
Chargé d'Affaires to Mexico.	Fourth Auditor of the Treasury.
Chargé d'Affaires to Sweden.	Treasurer of the United States.
Chargé d'Affaires to Peru.	Register of the Treasury.
Secretary of Legation to Great Britain.	Judge of Territory of Arkansas.
Secretary of Legation to France.	Treasurer of Mint United States.
Secretary of Legation to the Netherlands.	

Marshals of the United States for the Districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, and Missouri.

Attorneys of the United States for the Districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, New Jersey, Louisiana, Kentucky, Virginia, Tennessee, Missouri, New Hampshire, Connecticut, New York, Alabama, Indiana, Florida.

\* It is remarkable enough that the only public officer removed by President Jackson, on the very first day of his entering upon the discharge of his duties (besides the heads of Departments) was General Wm. HENRY HARRISON, Minister to Colombia.

Collectors and Surveyors of the Customs, Naval (Revenue) Officers, and Appraisers, as follows: In Maine, three; New Hampshire, one; Massachusetts, nine; Vermont, one; Connecticut, one; New York, eleven; New Jersey, one; Pennsylvania, two; Delaware, one; Maryland, three; District of Columbia, two; Virginia, one; North Carolina, two; Louisiana, four; Western States and Territories, six.

Indian Agents, six.

Navy Agents, three.

Receivers and Registers of Land Offices, twenty-six.

Consuls for foreign ports, twenty-one.

Clerks, &c. in public offices at the seat of Government, number large, but not accurately known.

POSTMASTERS, *four hundred and ninety-one*, viz.

In Maine, fifteen.

In New Hampshire, fifty-five.

In Vermont, twenty-two.

In Massachusetts, twenty-eight.

In Rhode Island, three.

In Connecticut, twenty.

In New York, one hundred and thirty-one.

In New Jersey, fourteen.

In Pennsylvania, thirty-five.

In Delaware, sixteen.

In Maryland fourteen.

In District of Columbia, one.

In Virginia, eight.

In North Carolina, four.

In Georgia, two.

In Alabama, two.

In Mississippi, five.

In Louisiana, four.

In Tennessee, twelve.

In Kentucky, sixteen.

In Ohio, fifty-one.

In Indiana, nineteen.

In Illinois, three.

In Missouri, seven.

In Florida, one.

In Arkansas, two.

In Michigan, one.

Besides these direct removals from office by the Executive, there was a host of removals of such persons as held office by secondary appointments, such as clerks, inspectors, &c., in the Custom-house, whom we have no means of numbering. We have a statement before us, however, which may afford the reader some idea of the extent of the proscription in their case. In the Custom-house at Boston alone, out of fifty-eight persons employed in different capacities, *forty* were removed!

Such was the slashing operation of the first year's Administration of the pretended Democracy. What was the further extent of the "reform"—the *task* which, President JACKSON said in his inaugural, was "inscribed on the list of Executive duties in characters too legible to be overlooked," we have not time at present to follow out through the succeeding years of the improved Administration of the Government.

Nor have we time to compose a homily upon the virtues of disinterestedness, consistency, meekness, charity, and forbearance exhibited in such interesting lights in this chapter of political history. Neither shall we here debate upon the effect and consequences, any more than upon the character and complexion of the motives of the principal actors in this scene of proscription. Happily we find these so truly and plainly portrayed in a public document now before us that it will be a happy relief to our readers to meet with what is so applicable, from so able a hand, instead of ours. In a report made in the Senate on the 9th of February, 1835, by Mr. CALHOUN, as chairman of a select committee appointed "to inquire into the extent of the Executive patronage, the causes which have contributed to its great increase of late," &c. we find the following striking passages:

"But as greatly as these causes [increase of public expenditures, &c.] have added to the force of patronage of late, there are others of a different nature, which have contributed to give it a far greater and more dangerous influence. At the head of these should be placed the practice so greatly extended, if not for the first time introduced, of removing from office persons well qualified, and who had faithfully performed their duty, in order to fill their places with those who are recommended on the ground that they belong to the party in power.

"Your committee feel that they are touching ground which may be considered of a party character, and which, were it possible, consistently with the discharge of their duty, they would wholly avoid, as their object is to inquire into facts only, as contributing to increase the patronage of the Executive, without looking to intention, or desiring to cast censure on those in power; but while they would cautiously avoid any remark of a party character, as inconsistent with the gravity of the subject, and incompatible with the intention of the Senate in directing the inquiry, they trust that they are incapable of shrinking from the performance of the important and solemn duty confided to them, of thoroughly investigating to the bottom a subject involving, as they believe, the fate of our political institutions and the liberty of the country, by declining to investigate, fully and freely as regards its character and consequence, every measure or practice of the Government connected with the inquiry, whether it has or has not been a subject of party controversy.

"In speaking of the practice of removing from office on party ground as of recent date, and, of course, comprehended under the causes which have of late contributed to the increase of Executive patronage, your committee are aware that cases of such removals may be found in the early stages of the Government; but they are so few, and exercised so little influence, that they may be said to constitute instances rather than as forming a practice. It is only within the last few years that removals from office have been introduced as

a system, and, for the first time, an opportunity has been afforded of testing the tendency of the practice, and witnessing the mighty increase which it has given to the force of Executive patronage, and the entire and fearful change, in conjunction with other causes, it is effecting in the character of our political system. Nor will it require much reflection to perceive in what manner it contributes to increase so vastly the extent of Executive patronage.

"So long as offices were considered as public trusts, to be conferred on the honest, the faithful, and capable, for the common good, and not for the benefit or gain of the incumbent or his party, and so long as it was the practice of the Government to continue in office those who faithfully performed their duties, its patronage, in point of fact, was limited to the mere power of nominating to accidental vacancies or to newly-created offices, and could, of course, exercise but a moderate influence, either over the body of the community or of the office-holders themselves: but when this practice was reversed—when offices, instead of being considered as public trusts, to be conferred on the deserving, were regarded as *the spoils of victory*, to be bestowed as rewards for partisan services, without respect to merit; when it became to be understood that all who hold office hold by the tenure of partisan zeal and party service, it is easy to see that the certain, direct, and inevitable tendency of such a state of things is to convert the entire body of those in office into corrupt and supple instruments of power, and to raise up a host of hungry, greedy, and subservient partisans, ready for every service, however base and corrupt. Were a premium offered for the best means of extending to the utmost the power of patronage; to destroy the love of country, and to substitute a spirit of subserviency and man-worship; to encourage vice and discourage virtue; and, in a word, to prepare for the subversion of liberty, and the establishment of despotism, no scheme more perfect could be devised; and such must be the tendency of the practice, with whatever intention adopted, or to whatever extent pursued."

Mr. CALHOUN, in this report, refers to cases of removals which may be found in the early stages of the Government, which he justly remarks are so few, and exercised so little influence, that they may be said to constitute instances of exception rather than as forming a practice. Few indeed were they! In the eight years' administration of Mr. MADISON, they numbered only *fourteen*; in the eight years of Mr. MONROE, only *thirteen*; and in the four years of JOHN Q. ADAMS, only *three*!\* What was the number during a single year of the Administration of the party which succeeded in putting down an Administration which made so "few" removals, the reader will have learned from the preceding enumeration.

As if to afford to posterity a standard by which men should in all time to come be able to measure, with the greatest precision, the distance between the professions and practices of ambitious demagogues, the Senate committee of 1826 proposed, along with their *six bills* of retrenchment and reform, an *amendment to the Constitution* to prevent the appointment of Members of Congress to civil office under the General Government, to which their report refers as follows:

"The committee have also reported another proposition of amendment, intended to exclude Senators and Representatives from appointment to civil offices under the authority of the Federal Government; and this proposition they will not despair of seeing referred to the consideration and decision of the People."

This is the standard of the pretended "democracy," set up in the year 1826, by its leaders, Messrs. BENTON and VAN BUREN. And here is the evidence of the fidelity of the same party to the principles under the name and garb of which they came into power:

#### *Appointments of Members of Congress to Office since the beginning of Gen. Jackson's Administration.*

Martin Van Buren, of N. Y. Secretary of State.  
Samuel D. Ingham, of Pa. Secretary of the Treasury.  
John H. Eaton, of Tenn. Secretary of War.  
John Branch, of N. C. Secretary of the Navy.  
John M. Berrien, of Geo. Attorney General.  
Wm. C. Rives, of Va. Minister to France.  
Louis McLane, of Del. Minister to England.  
Levi Woodbury, of N. H. Secretary of the Navy.  
John Randolph, of Va. Minister to Russia.  
Mahlon Dickerson, of N. J. Secretary of the Navy.  
John Forsyth, of Geo. Secretary of State.  
Felix Grundy, of Tenn. Attorney General.  
Edward Livingston, of La. Secretary of State.  
Powhatan Ellis, of Miss. Minister to Mexico.  
John McKinley, of Ala. Judge Supreme Court.  
S. R. Hobbie, of N. Y. Assistant Postmaster General.  
John Finlay, of Pa. Postmaster at Chambersburg.  
Thos. P. Moore, of Ky. Minister to Colombia.  
H. A. Muhlenberg, of Pa. Minister to Austria.  
Andrew Stevenson, of Va. Minister to England.  
John Chandler, of Me. Col' of Portland & Falmouth.  
Wm. Smith, of S. C. Judge Supreme Court.  
John Anderson, of Me. Collector of Portland.  
James W. Ripley, of Me. Captain of Ordnance.  
C. C. Cambreleng, of N. Y. Minister to Russia.  
Hector Craig, of N. Y. Surveyor Port of New York.  
Chas. G. De Witt, of N. Y. Minister to Guatemala.  
Win. Wilkins, of Pa. Minister to Russia.  
James Buchanan, of Pa. Minister to Russia.

Geo. M. Dallas, of Pa. Minister to Russia.  
Thos. H. Crawford, of Pa. Indian Commissioner, &c.  
Wiley Thompson, of Geo. Indian Commissioner.  
James M. Wayne, of Geo. Judge Supreme Court.  
Nicholas D. Coleman, of Ky. Postmaster.  
Philip P. Barbour, of Va. Judge Supreme Court.  
Jno. G. Stower, of N. Y. Attorney or Marshal of Ala.  
Francis Baylies, of Mass. Charge d'Affaires to Buenos Ayres.  
Edward Kavanagh, of Me. Minister to Portugal.  
Edw. A. Hannegan, of Ind. Register of Land Office.  
Thomas Irwin, of Pa. Judge of District Court.  
John Biddle, of Mich. Receiver of Land Office.  
Geo. W. Owen, of Ala. Collector of Mobile.  
R. H. Gillet, of N. Y. Indian Commission.  
Joseph Hall, of Me. Custom-house officer at Boston.  
Edward Lucas, of Va. Sup't Harper's Ferry Armory.  
Jesse Miller, of Pa. First Auditor.  
Gorham Parks, of Me. Marshal.  
Michael W. Ash, of Pa. Navy Agent.  
Benj. C. Howard, of Md. Commissioner about Michigan Boundary.  
Andrew T. Judson, of Conn. Judge of District Court.  
Humphrey H. Leavitt, of O. Judge of District Court.  
Ely Moore, of N. Y. Surveyor of Customs.  
Isaac H. Bronson, of N. Y. Judge in Florida.  
Samuel Cushman, of N. H. Postmaster at Portsmouth.  
Samuel J. Gholson, of Mass. District Judge.  
Robert T. Lytle, of O. Surveyor General.

\* Executive Documents. House of Representatives, 1st Session 26th Congress, Document No. 132



Isaac S. Pennyacker, of Va. District Judge.  
 Arnold Plumer, of Pa. Marshal.  
 Nathl. Garrow, of N. Y. Marshal.  
 Geo. Loyall, of Va. Navy Agent.  
 Leonard Jarvis, of Me. Navy Agent.

George W. Jones, of Wisconsin, Surveyor General.  
 Wm. Findlay, of Pa. Treasurer of Mint.  
 Jeromus Johnson, of N. Y. Appraiser.  
 Wilson Lunpinkin, of Geo. Indian Agent.  
 Thos. Maxwell, of N. Y. Postmaster at Elmira.

[The greater part of the names included in this list were Members of Congress at the time of their appointment. Others had very recently been, and none of them, it is believed, but would have come within the space of two years after service in Congress.]

Thus it is that the party in power have falsified all their professions, and thereby converted this Government into a mere machine for raising revenue for the reward, support, and gratification of a host of office-holders, who in return devote all the ability and energy with which nature has endowed them to perpetuate their ill-gotten power. As now administered, not only is the Government just such a machine, but the design is not concealed to keep it such; and, if the party succeed in re-electing its President, and follow the indications from its powerful leaders, we shall beyond doubt have a beautiful illustration, before long, of the Locofoco beau-ideal of Government, or, as Mr. Attorney General BUTLER described it, of "A PURE AND EARNEST DEMOCRACY, ILLUMINATED BY THE SOUNDTEST PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY."

Just such a Democracy, or a Democracy in many points resembling it, France for a brief period once enjoyed the blessing of. Some of its maxims have come down to us in history; one of which is, that no man should be richer than another, and another that the spoils of the Aristocrats belong of right to the Sans-culottes. Perhaps, however, a scrap of that history will illustrate the points of resemblance between the two systems better than any thing that we can say. We conclude this article, therefore, with the following extract:

FROM MOORE'S JOURNAL OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

"SEPT. 13, 1792.—The character of some of the Deputies already chosen by the Department of Paris does not tend to convey high expectations of the ensuing Convention. MARAT is of the number; he is supposed to have obtained his honor partly by his own popularity among the low classes, and partly through the influence of a faction, at the head of which are Danton, the Minister of Justice, and Robespierre. As the reputation of Marat was not of pure white previous to the 2d of September, and has been considered as of a scarlet hue since, it was thought necessary to prepare the minds of the electors, and endeavor to conciliate them in his favor, before the day of election. For this purpose Chabot, who was formerly a Franciscan friar, has been since a patriotic orator, and is already chosen a Deputy to the Convention, made an oration in his favor in the Society of Jacobins, of which many of the electors are members. As this discourse is certainly of a very extraordinary nature, and as it discovers the disposition both of the orator and of the person he recommends, I shall give the following passage from it:

"MARAT is reproached with being of a sanguinary disposition; that he contributed, for example, to the late massacres in the prisons; but, in doing so, he acted in the true spirit of the revolution; for it was not to be expected that, while our bravest patriots went to the frontiers, we should remain here exposed to the rage of the prisoners, who were promised arms and the opportunity of assassinating us. We are told that he is sanguinary, because oftener than once he demanded the blood of the aristocrats, and also that of the corrupt members of the Constituent Assembly. But it is well known that the plan of the aristocrats always has been, and still is, to make a general carnage of the sans-culottes. Now, as the number of the latter is to that of the former in the proportion of ninety-nine to one, it is evident that he who proposes to kill one, to prevent the killing of ninety-nine, is not a bloodthirsty man. Neither can he justly be called an incendiary, for he proposed to give the spoils of the aristocrats to the sans-culottes! How, then, can he be accused of wishing to harm them?"









LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 011 899 404 8

